



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/768,614	01/30/2004	Robert G. DeMoor	TI-35548	6753
23494	7590	12/30/2009	EXAMINER	
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999 DALLAS, TX 75265			LE, TUAN H	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	2622			
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
12/30/2009	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@ti.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/768,614	Applicant(s) DEMOOR, ROBERT G.
	Examiner TUAN H. LE	Art Unit 2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2009.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3 and 8-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3,8-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 1 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS-68)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1-3, 14-16** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Also, since claims 8 -12 do not contain the "two or more acquisition" feature, therefore the same rejection as in previous non-final office is maintained.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1, line 5, "...optical image acquisition..." should be changed to "...optical image acquisitions...".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Lavelle (US 6,362,851 to Lavelle et al).

Regarding **claim 8**, Lavelle discloses a method of acquiring an image of a human subject with a digital camera having predetermined features, the method comprising:

simulating for the subject the acquisition of an image of the subject by digital camera (Fig. 1) wherein the simulation only simulates the acquisition of an image

without actually acquiring the image (Lavelle, Fig. 9b, column 8 lines 26-41, wherein a user can select no delay, ten seconds, or twenty seconds for shutter delay before an image is taken; also simulation of optical image acquisition happens during shutter delay).

after a preselected period of time, acquiring an image of the subject by the digital camera (Lavelle, column 26, lines 31-35, wherein the shutter speed varies between 1/30 and 1/175 second in the timer 290).

Regarding **claim 9**, Lavelle discloses aforementioned limitations of the parent claim. Additionally, Lavelle discloses

simulating the acquisition of an image of the subject includes providing the sights and sounds associated with the acquisition of an image of the subject by the digital camera (Lavelle, Fig. 9b, column 8 lines 26-41, wherein the led 390 blinks and the beeper sounds once per second for the final five seconds.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lavelle (US 6,362,851 to Lavelle et al) in view of Misumi (US 6,483,993 to Misumi et al).

Regarding **claim 1**, Lavelle discloses

a digital camera (Fig. 1) comprising:
a photosensitive region (CCD) for recording an optical image of a human subject (Lavelle, Fig. 1, Abstract);
a controllable shutter (inherent part) for exposing the photosensitive region (Lavelle, column 26, lines 31-35, wherein the shutter speed varies between 1/30 and 1/175 second);
a timer (timer 290), the timer providing a selected time delay between simulated optical image acquisition and an actual optical image acquisition, wherein the simulation simulates the optical image acquisition without actually acquiring the image (Lavelle, Fig. 9b, column 8 lines 26-41, wherein a user can select no delay, ten seconds, or twenty seconds for shutter delay before an image is taken; also simulation of optical image acquisition happens during shutter delay).

However, Lavelle does not disclose

two or more acquisition.

On the other hand, Misumi discloses

two or more acquisition (LED lighting generated of camera position display portion 14 and message generated by guidance display portion 7), (Misumi, fig. 1, fig. 2, column 6 lines 15-23, 40-43, wherein led lightning and "wait for photographing" prompts to-be-photographed subject).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the acquisition by Misumi into the camera by Lavelle so as to guide to-be-photographed subject during image capture

Art Unit: 2622

process because such incorporation results in an optimum condition for capturing a face image.

Regarding **claim 2**, Lavelle and Misumi disclose aforementioned limitations of the parent claim. Additionally, Lavelle discloses

simulated image acquisition is accompanied by sounds of typical shutter operation (Lavelle, it is inherent that sounds are generated during shutter operation).

Regarding **claim 3**, Lavelle and Misumi disclose aforementioned limitations of the parent claim. Additionally, Lavelle discloses

a flash mechanism, the flash mechanism receiving low-power activation during the simulated image acquisition (Lavelle, column 8 lines 18-25, wherein the flash is in automatic flash).

Regarding **claim 13**, Lavelle and Misumi disclose all of the limitations of the parent claim. Additionally, Lavelle discloses

a first mode of operation (no shutter delay), the digital camera in the first mode acquiring an image of the subject in response to user input in the first mode of operation (Lavelle, Fig. 9b, column 8 lines 26-41, wherein a user can select no delay for shutter delay before an image is taken); and

a second mode of operation (10 or 20 seconds for shutter delay), the digital camera simulating acquiring an image of the subject in response to user input in the second mode of operation, the digital camera acquiring an image at a pre-selected time after simulating acquiring image (Lavelle, Fig. 9b, column 8 lines 26-41, wherein a user

can select ten seconds or twenty seconds for shutter delay before an image is taken; also simulation of optical image acquisition happens during shutter delay).

Regarding **claim 14**, Lavelle and Misumi disclose all of the limitations of the parent claim. Additionally, Lavelle discloses

a first mode of operation (no shutter delay), the digital camera acquiring an image of the subject in response to user input in the first mode of operation (Lavelle, Fig. 9b, column 8 lines 26-41, wherein a user can select no delay for shutter delay before an image is taken); and

a second mode of operation (10 or 20 seconds for shutter delay), the digital camera selecting for acquisition an image of the subject having predetermined features (Lavelle, Fig. 9b, column 8 lines 26-41, wherein a user can select ten seconds or twenty seconds for shutter delay before an image with predetermined features is taken).

Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lavelle (US 6,362,851 to Lavelle et al) in view of Misumi (US 6,483,993 to Misumi et al) and further in view of Chatani et al (U.S. Pub. 2004/0075743 A1).

Regarding **claim 15**, Lavelle and Misumi disclose all of the limitations of the parent claim. However, Lavelle and Misumi do not disclose

the predetermined features are determined by a pattern recognition program

On the other hand, Wada discloses

the predetermined features are determined by a pattern recognition program (see Chatanie et al, paragraphs [0011] and [0012], wherein image selection parameters are entered).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine image capture with specified parameter as described by Chatanie et al with the digital camera as described by Lavelle and Misumi in order to selectively store desired images because such combination saves time to search through a whole image database for a certain image.

Regarding **claim 16**, Lavelle and Misumi disclose all of the limitations of the parent claim. However, Lavelle and Misumi does not disclose

the predetermined features are facial expression.

On the other hand, Chatanie discloses

the predetermined features are facial expression (see Chatani et al, paragraph [0053], wherein semantic parameters include closed eyes, crossed eye)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine image capture with semantic parameters as described by Chatanie et al with the digital camera as described by Lavelle in order to selectively store desired images because such combination saves time to search through a whole image database for a certain image.

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lavelle (US 6,362,851 to Lavelle et al) in view of Chatani et al (U.S. Pub. 2004/0075743 A1).

Regarding **claim 10**, Lavelle discloses aforementioned limitations of the parent claims.

However, Lavelle does not disclose

providing a program associated with a processing unit for identifying the predetermined features;

acquiring a series of images and applying the images to the processing unit; and analyzing the images using the program.

On the other hand, Chatani et al discloses

providing a program associated with a processing unit (306) for identifying the predetermined features (see Chatani et al, Fig. 3, paragraph [0012], wherein a computer program obtains image selection parameters);

acquiring a series of images and applying the images to the processing unit (see Chatani et al, paragraph [0011], wherein the imaging device is capable of capturing image data for a plurality of digital images); and

analyzing the images using the program, (see Chatani et al, Fig. 8 step 808, wherein subset of images with specified parameters is generated).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan to combine image analysis by using the program as disclosed by Chatani et al with the method as disclosed by Lavelle in order to analyze a series of images because such combination provides automatic selection of digital photographs based on user provided criteria and allows user to preview images under various conditions, (Chatani et al, paragraph [0009]).

As for **claim 11**, as previously mentioned in the discussion of claim 10, Lavelle and Chatani et al disclose all of the limitations of the parent claim. In addition, Chatani et al discloses that the first image in which the predetermined feature is identified is

stored, (see Chatani et al, Fig. 4, wherein image in the buffer 410 is stored in memory 412).

As for **claim 12**, as previously mentioned in the discussion of claim 10, Lavelle and Chatanie et al discloses all of the limitations of the parent claim. In addition, Chatanie et al discloses that the acquiring of a series images is provided in response to signals from a timing unit (see Chatanie et al, paragraphs [0007] and [0011], wherein multiple images are capture in high rate photography).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TUAN H. LE whose telephone number is (571)270-1130. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30-5:00 F 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on (571) 272-3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tuan H Le/
Examiner, Art Unit 2622

/Jason Chan/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2622